

## REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated March 4, 2004, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on June 4, 2004. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-31, 33-36, and 39-46 remain pending in this application. Claims 1-31, 33-36, and 39-46 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-49 of U.S. Patent No. 6,218,301. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the limitation of film thickness is an obvious variation. Applicants are submitting a terminal disclaimer in a separate paper. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Having addressed all issues set out in the Final Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith M. Tackett  
Registration No. 32,008  
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Attorney for Applicants